53

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1580 of 2005

(Original Application No.1283 of 1997)

PETITIONER		Rajneesh Prasad Pathak son of Shri Jagdish Prasad Pathak, aged about 33 years, resident of near Mulkraj Hotel, Railway Station, Bilaspur (C.G).
		Versus
RESPONDENTS	**1**	State of M.P. (now Chhattisgarh), Through : Secretary, Department of School Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).
	2	Joint Director, Education, Bilaspur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G).
	3.	District Education Officer, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Appearance:

Shri Rakesh Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.
Ku. Sunita Jain, P.L. appears for the State/ respondents.

ORAL ORDER
(11.12.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J

Heard finally with the consent of the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Teacher on Adhoc basis by order dated 1.12.1984. This appointment was for a period of 3 months or until further order, whichever is earlier He completed the tenure of the first appointment order thereafter his services were discontinued and later on by another order dated 18.9.1986 the petitioner was again appointed and this time also he continued upto complete tenure of the order, but thereafter his service was again discontinued and till then his case has not been considered. He submits that many petitions were filed in this regard and the S.A.T. as also High Court of Madhya Pradesh has passed many orders and in these orders, it has been directed that the petitioners shall file a representation setting out their qualifications and the

54

respondents may consider the same in accordance with law and give employment to the petitioners, if there is any vacancy and if necessary relax the age bar also.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that similar order may also be passed in this petition and accordingly, this petition may also be disposed of.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have also perused the writ petition as also the common order passed by the High Court of M.P. in W.P.S. No.397 of 2004, W.P.S.No.399 of 2004, W.P(s) No.62/2004 and W.P(S) No.6923 of 2002.

In view of the above, this petition is disposed of with a direction that if so advised, the petitioner may file a detailed representation before the concerned authority within a period of 3 weeks from today setting out his qualification and if such a representation is filed, the concerned authority may consider the same in accordance with law and give employment to the petitioner, if there is any vacancy and if necessary relax the age bar.

With the above observations, this petition stands finally disposed of.

C.c. as per rules.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge